

Question No 68 - Development Management

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (4) In Part (4) No (0)

Yes (LP321-67, LP318-31, LP28-68, LP9-10)

In part (LP385-57, LP292-29, LP272-22, LP267-48)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Policy supported.	Support noted.	LP28-68, LP318-31
2	General support. Suggest an explicit reference to the SRN in traffic generation/road safety; requirements for Transport Assessments (including cumulative) for developments likely to affect SRN junctions; clarification on delivery of modal shift in areas with limited non-car options near SRN corridors; explicitly consider coordination with SRN drainage; and address the proximity to the SRN when assessing hazardous installations and environmental sensitivities (air quality/noise).	No change proposed to the plan. The Local Plan, alongside Places for Everyone, will form the development plan for Manchester. The specific elements are covered by Policy JP C8 in Places for Everyone.	LP321-67
3	Recommend the inclusion of reference (with the possible inclusion of the website link as a footnote) to the principles of our Active Design guidance.	No change proposed to the plan. The Council intends to update the Residential Quality Guidance which will pick up on existing wording on active design.	LP9-10
4	Suggest first clause includes reference to accessibility for disabled people.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy includes a clause that requires accessibility to buildings and neighbourhoods.	LP385-57
5	Suggest additional clauses as follows: Future climate scenario risk modelling (see answer to Q	No change proposed to the plan. The suggestion around climate risk modelling is already taken into	LP292-29, LP261-39

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	65); Responsible resource stewardship (e.g. the material impact of the development); and Impact on residents, both in physical terms (shading, winds, etc.), and in terms of the liveability of the neighbourhood (crowding, impact on amenities, impact on neighbourhood character).	account via other processes (e.g. Environment Agency climate change modelling). Moreover, the plan should be read as a whole and the suggested additional clauses are covered by other policies within the plan. (Policies ZC1, ZC and D1).	
6	General support. Suggest a degree of flexibility sufficient to support the application of the policy in relation to complex, large-scale regeneration projects like Mayfield.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole and flexibility is applied at appropriate points (e.g. Policy DC1).	LP272-22
7	Effects of development on residents as well as on amenities should be stated. Equally there should be links to other parts of the plan e.g density of HMOs, fast food takeaways etc.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy implicitly covers the impacts on residents in its treatment of various amenity issues. The plan should be read as a whole and it is not considered explicit links to other parts of the plan is necessary.	LP267-48
8	Suggest additional wording in the policy to ensure on or from development in proximity to United Utilities assets is considered and any appropriate mitigation is included.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy is considered to account for the potential impacts and mitigation across all types of development and there is no need for additional clarification.	LP386-29
9	Suggest the policy includes the need for early engagement and meaningful consultation between developers proposing sensitive uses and existing major occupiers in the vicinity. Policies should also be embedded with the agent of change principle to ensure that the operational interests of major employers are not compromised.	Change agreed. Include a new final bullet in the policy. “Designed to ensure that where the operation of an existing business or community facility could have a significant adverse effect on new development the applicant (or agent of change) should be required to provide suitable mitigation before the development has been completed.” Add new supporting text at 16.3.	LP382-12

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
		“The Agent of Change principle places the responsibility for mitigating the impact of noise and other nuisances on the new development. This means that where new developments are proposed close to existing businesses and uses that generate noise, demonstrate how they manage the impact of proposals, for example, new residential uses, to avoid adverse effects to the businesses. This includes identifying suitable mitigation as part of the planning submission, which if found to be acceptable takes place before development is completed. The Agent of Change principle works both ways. For example, if a new noise-generating use is proposed close to existing noise-sensitive uses, such as residential development or businesses, the onus is on the new use to ensure its building or activity is designed to protect existing users or residents from noise impacts.”	
10	Suggest pedestrianised spaces need to be made with appropriate and durable materials; and more bins and benches required in the city centre.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy addresses both materials requirements and the need for suitable refuse requirements associated with development. General provision for refuse facilities is an operational matter not governed by the Local Plan.	LP363-3
11	Suggest that the wording have regard to needs to be strengthened and could be reworded to read take account of.	No change proposed to the plan. The wording is consistent with other policies within the plan.	LP291-43

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
12	Suggest the design for health clause has additional point related to being supported by a Health Impact Assessment for major developments and development in areas of known poor health outcomes.	No change proposed to the plan. Policy JP P6 in Places for Everyone includes the consideration for health impact assessments.	LP277-12
13	Suggest duplication between Policies D1 and DM1 to DM4 with opportunity to combine the policies.	No change proposed to the plan. The level of detail within the policies identified is considered necessary justifying a degree of cross over between the policies.	LP264-8

Question No 69 - Residential extensions

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (3) In Part (4) No (0)

Yes (LP321-68, LP309-60, LP28-69)

In part (LP292-30, LP290-26, LP267-49, LP27-17)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Q69 Residential Extensions: I agree with the policy	Support noted	LP309-60
2	The Council should take the response form Steady State Manchester (SSM) as my response for this question.		LP261-40
3	Particularly agree with the clause which prevents a very narrow gap between properties because this is impossible to maintain and will cause damp and potential infestations. One such gap has been created in West Didsbury which I anticipate will cause problems in the future and which should have been stopped by building control.	General support noted. Building Control is separate to Planning in terms of legislative requirements	LP404-28
4	We recommend that the following bullet point is added to this policy - They have no adverse impact on the operation of, or access to, existing utility services such as water mains and public sewers.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole, in particular, Policies DM1 and SP2 which include sufficient detail to cover the proposed addition.	LP386-30 (United Utilities)
5	National Highways supports managing development impacts and neighbourhood character. From an SRN perspective, extensions increasing occupancy/vehicle ownership may indirectly affect SRN junctions, especially near M56 J5. Cumulative impacts near SRN corridors should also be referenced.	No change proposed to the plan. The Local Plan, alongside Places for Everyone, will form the development plan for Manchester. The specific elements are covered by Policy JP C8 in Places for Everyone.	LP321-68 (National Highways)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
6	Sound, subject to change - We support the inclusion of the third and final bullet points to Policy DM4 requiring that development proposals on 'backland' sites are of a scale and design that is compatible with the character of the area and, within a Conservation Area, the built form and surrounding spaces preserve or enhance the character of the area. However, we recommend a minor amendment to the wording of the final bullet point to bring it in line with that of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. Suggested Change - Amend the final bullet point to read: <i>"in the case of development within a Conservation Area, the built form and the surrounding spaces preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area."</i>	Change agreed, The last bullet to Policy DM4 "in the case of development within a Conservation Area, in particular, the built form and the surrounding spaces maintain preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area.	LP318-32 (Historic England)
7	From experience we know that the criteria for approving extensions are not transparent. For example a planning officer might conclude that an attic extension using black tiles on the facing is in keeping with the slate roofs in the area, when actually the monolithic appearance of the 'barn' on top of the house is a domineering eyesore. There seems to be little scope for constructive engagement with affected neighbours on this. Too often, owners and builders put an extension in place that then requires retrospective planning permission. The default position should be to refuse retrospective permission unless there are very	No change proposed to the plan. The change proposed would not conform with national policy and guidance. The policy provides sufficient guidance to consider issues on a case-by-case basis in any development proposals.	LP292-30

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	exceptional circumstances There should also be a heavy financial disincentive – for example a significantly higher fee for a retrospective application		
8	We welcome the requirement that residential extensions require that “only permeable materials are used for outside surfaces”. We note the recent RHS report which found that 42% of domestic garden space is paved over (55% of front garden space and 36% of back garden space). Paving over large sections of garden reduces space for nature as well as exacerbating flooding as water has nowhere to go . However, it is unclear how many front garden conversions are undertaken without planning permission any any subsequent enforcement. We also note that Policy DM2 makes no reference to any requirement to improve the energy efficiency of these properties. In the list of bullet points after “Extensions to residential properties will be allowed subject to compliance with other relevant policies in this Plan and the following criteria:”, we propose adding “they would not lead to an increase in carbon emissions”.	No change proposed to the plan. The changes proposed would not conform with national policy and guidance.	LP290-26
9	We support most aspects of this policy but wish to draw attention to the highly subjective criteria for approving extensions, particularly in terms of the building materials, their fit with the local area and their impacts on other residents. We have seen a growing number of retrospective planning	No change proposed to the plan. The policy wording provides sufficient flexibility that takes account of the issue raised. Any changes would not conform with national policy and guidance.	LP267-49

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	applications, and it would be helpful if there were something in the Plan to discourage this. We recognise too, that enforcement resources are limited but without adequate enforcement, all sorts of deviations from the polices proliferate.		
10	A criterion should be added for residential extensions that “they would not lead to an increase in carbon emissions"	No change proposed to the plan. The changes proposed would not conform with national policy and guidance.	LP27-17

Question No 70 - Flat Conversions

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (6) In Part (2) No (0)

Yes (LP321-69, LP309-61, LP292-31, LP290-27, LP267-50, LP28-70)

In part (LP304-11, LP27-34)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Q70 Flat Conversions: I agree with the Policy.	Support noted	LP309-61
2	Would like to see mention of EV charging for terraced streets	Where other policies in the Local Plan deal with these matters they are not repeated as the plan should be read as a whole. Covered by Policy T1	LP28-70
3	The Council should take the response from Steady State Manchester (SSM) as my response for this question.	Comment noted.	LP261-41
4	Flat conversions have caused a lot of problems in these small Edwardian terraces [in Moss Side] and should be completely banned. These houses and their small yards are totally unsuitable for splitting into flats.	Comments noted.	LP396-3
5	The focus on parking pressures is particularly relevant near SRN corridors. Applications near SRN access points should include transport assessments to consider potential junction capacity/traffic flow impacts. Cumulative effects of multiple conversions near SRN routes should also be considered. The emphasis on accessibility is	No change proposed to the plan. The Local Plan, alongside Places for Everyone, will form the development plan for Manchester. The specific elements are covered by Policy JP C8 in Places for Everyone.	LP321-69 (National Highways)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	supported, with integration to reduce car dependency in SRN-adjacent areas.		
6	Agree in part. 'Satisfactory bin storage' is too vague. In a mid terrace conversion, this would usually result in bins being stored in the small front garden. A developer might argue that these are off the street and that is satisfactory. In reality, these look a mess especially once overflowing and neighbours fill them when stored there and the bins should be out of sight. The draft states that in small mid terrace properties, 'the council will give particularly careful consideration to situation in which the conversion of small terraced properties are proposed.' We trust that the council carefully consider all planning applications, yet the policy here does not stipulate whether they are carefully considering whether to approve or refuse it. We would urge the council to refuse flat conversions of small terraced properties. A number were converted in Moss Side (without permission) from 2008 until 2013 where we live and these have caused misery for both the occupants and the neighbours, with living areas adjacent to neighbour's bedrooms, and making homes that would have been suitable for families now of no use as family housing.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy wording provides sufficient flexibility that takes account of the issue raised. Any changes would not conform with national policy and guidance.	LP304-11
7	Flat conversions must also protect family homes that are currently used as HMOs. The draft policy could allow HMO landlords to convert former family houses into flats, permanently reducing the supply	No change proposed to the plan. The policy wording provides sufficient flexibility that takes account of the issue raised. Any changes would not conform with national policy and guidance. Planning	LP293-4

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	of larger homes. This would also increase occupancy density and potentially allow landlords to avoid HMO licensing. DM3 should explicitly apply to any property originally built and reasonably capable of functioning as a single-family home, regardless of current use.	permission would be required for the conversion on an HMO to flats and a full assessment of issues against policy would be undertaken.	
8	We agree with the presumption of retaining family homes in residential areas and also support sensitive conversions in larger properties which would instead remain unoccupied.	Support noted	LP292-31, LP267-50
9	We agree with the presumption of retaining family homes in residential areas, and that large properties should require sensitive conversions. We would also request that rather than just focussing on off-street parking provision that developers be required to consider 'car-free' conversions in City Centre areas and where excellent public transport services are available. We note that Policy DM3 makes no reference to any requirement to improve the energy efficiency of these properties. In the list of bullet points after "The Council will normally refuse permission for any developments in this category which:", we propose adding "that would lead to an increase in carbon emissions".	Where other policies in the Local Plan deal with these matters they are not repeated as the plan should be read as a whole.	LP290-27
10	A criterion should be added for the refusal of flat conversions "that would lead to an increase in carbon emissions"	No change proposed to the plan. The changes proposed would not conform with national policy and guidance.	LP27-34

Question No 71 - Housing on 'Backland' sites

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (3) In Part (0) No (0)

Yes (LP321-70, LP309-62, LP28-71)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Q71 Housing on "Backland" Sites: I agree with the Policy.	Support noted	LP309-62
2	I agree Backlands development should normally be refused. The inability of emergency services to attend inaccessible backland development is an additional factor against it.	Support noted	LP404-29
3	We recommend that the following bullet point is added to this policy - There is no adverse impact on the operation of, or access to, existing utility services such as water mains and public sewers.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan should be read as a whole, in particular, Policies DM1 and SP2 which include sufficient detail to cover the proposed addition.	LP386-31
4	Backland developments often rely on narrow/shared access routes. Near to SRN corridors/junctions, transport assessments should evaluate indirect impacts on SRN flow/safety. Cumulative effects should be considered where multiple infill schemes occur near the SRN. The protection of trees/habitats is supported where they contribute to air quality/noise buffering near SRN infrastructure. Proposals in Conservation Areas near SRN corridors should consider visual/environmental impacts on SRN users. Additionally, where land is identified	No change proposed to the plan. The Local Plan, alongside Places for Everyone, will form the development plan for Manchester. The specific elements are covered by Policy JP C8 in Places for Everyone.	LP321-70 (National Highways)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	between the motorway and existing properties for this type of infill, it is unlikely that National Highways would be able to support such development where that land lies in our ownership. We would also need to be content that construction on land in close proximity, but outside our ownership, did not cause physical issues with the network, or limit any future proposals for network enhancement.		
5	The Trust welcomes and supports the policy that development will not be permitted where there is a loss of important trees or other natural features of high amenity value or the loss of locally important wildlife habitats. Backland sites can also be important stepping stones for wildlife.	Support noted	LP291-44

Question No 72 - Shop Fronts and Related Signs

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (2) In Part (3) No (0)

Yes (LP318-33, LP28-72)

In part (LP292-32, LP267-51, LP23-10)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	The Council should take the response form Steady State Manchester (SSM) as my response for this question.	Comment noted.	LP261-42
2	Would like to see more sit in cafes. Expresses concerns about the types of signage used.	No change proposed to the plan. The issue of having more sit in cafes is outside of the scope of the Local Plan. The policy provides sufficient guidance to consider issues on a case-by-case basis in any advertisement proposals.	LP344-13
3	We support Policy DM5 which should help to ensure that changes to shops fronts and related signage is appropriate to the character of the area and, where necessary, conserves or enhances heritage assets.	Support noted	LP318-33 (Historic England)
4	It is suggested that the last 2 bullet points are replaced with the following. This is more straightforward, and we disagree with locating shutter boxes behind the fascia as this will make the fascia project in the same way that the external boxes would. External shutters should be discouraged. Solid externally mounted security grilles or shutters should be avoided. Security	No change proposed to the plan. The policy wording provides sufficient flexibility that takes account of the issue/objection raised. The policy provides sufficient guidance to consider issues on a case-by-case basis in any development proposals.	LP297-22

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	shutters should have sufficient perforation to retain visibility of the inside of the shop to allow an interesting street frontage while the shop is closed, to promote the feeling of activity, to allow natural surveillance into the shop, and to deter graffiti. The Council's shopfront design guide which is mentioned in the explanation should be adopted as a DPD otherwise it will not be a Council policy. Currently, it is no more than an information leaflet.		
5	Welcome this policy and its linked set of guidance Shopfront and Signage Design Guide. If possible there should be a requirement on owners and tenants to remove graffiti quickly, and to maintain the curtilage of their properties (i.e. the pavement that is on their property but is effectively part of the public space). We would like to see mention of, - appropriate levels of illumination: a number of shops now have excessive levels of brightness, which both wastes energy and is also an eyesore in the streetscape, - a closed door policy in winter for reasons of energy conservation.	General support noted. Issues of graffiti removal and closing of shop doors are outside of the scope of the Local Plan.	LP292-32
6	Policy DM 5 (Shop Fronts and Related Signs) is supported in principle. However, the policy should provide greater recognition for the requirements of modern retail operators, such as shopping centres, who often employ contemporary materials, design and lighting in order to maintain brand identity and customer experience. As such, greater flexibility	General support noted. No change proposed to the plan. The policy wording provides sufficient flexibility that takes account of the issue raised. The policy provides sufficient guidance to consider issues on a case-by-case basis in any development proposals.	LP23-10, LP276-17

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	should be provided to allow such shopfront and signage designs to be delivered in the appropriate places. A new bullet point should be introduced, as follows: <i>Ensure the proportion, scale, style, detailing, colour and materials make a positive contribution to the building and its context. This will require designs to consider the location and heritage assets such as conservation areas Listed Buildings or whether more contemporary shop fronts are required;</i> (page 206) Contemporary shopfront and signage designs may be appropriate where they achieve high standards of design and are compatible with the wider streetscene; The promotion of signage strategies for major new developments in the City is supported. However, consideration should also be given to the potential benefits of applying signage strategies to existing large-scale developments, such as the Arndale Centre, to support existing core retail areas, including the PSA and wider City Centre in delivering a consistent approach to signage and efficient delivery.		
7	We welcome this policy and its linked set of guidance Shopfront and Signage Design Guide However this guidance has been in place for some time now and seems to be implemented inconsistently. Consistency and enforcement for those who do not adhere to the policy will be key. We would like to see some mention of tackling graffiti. Opening shutters during daylight hours would be	General support noted. The removal of graffiti is outside the scope of the Local Plan.	LP267-51

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	helpful, but again must be adhered to and enforced, and there needs to be some recognition of this. There will need to be resources for this.		

Question No 73 – Advertisements

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (3) In Part (6) No (0)

Yes (LP321-71, LP305-28, LP280-9)

In part (LP292-33, LP290-28, LP267-52, LP28-73, LP27-19, LP23-6)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Would like some indication that the City Council will consider banning advertisements of carbon intensive products, as would resonate with its zero carbon ambitions.	No change proposed to the plan. The changes proposed would not conform with national policy and guidance.	LP28-73
2	Would like to see more sit in cafes. Expresses concerns about the types of signage used.	No change proposed to the policy. The issue of having more sit in cafes is outside of the scope of the Local Plan. The policy provides sufficient guidance to consider issues on a case-by-case basis in any advertisement proposals.	LP344-14
3	Inclusion of public safety criteria near SRN corridors/junctions is supported. Proposals for illuminated/large-format advertisements near SRN routes should be subject to additional scrutiny, including visibility studies and safety audits (driver distraction, visibility of traffic signs, and navigation aids). Where safety concerns exist, National Highways could not support large screen advertising near to the SRN.	No change proposed to the plan. The Local Plan, alongside Places for Everyone, will form the development plan for Manchester. The specific elements are covered by Policy JP C8 in Places for Everyone. Also covered by Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007	LP321-71 (National Highways)
4	We welcome the reference in Policy DM6 criterion a. to need for proposals for advertisements to take	Support noted	LP318-34

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	account of the general character of the area, including the presence of any features of historic, architectural, cultural or similar interest.		
5	MA supports Policy DM 6 and welcomes the requirement for proposals to take account of any adverse effects to Manchester Airport and any hindrance to air navigation aids when considering amenity and safety, as set out at sub-points (d) and (e).	Support noted	LP305-28 (Manchester Airport Group)
6	The first paragraph is unclear because if adverts are permitted in accordance with the 2007 Regulations, then they will not need an application. Maybe a better first paragraph would be Powers under the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements)(England) Regulations 2007 to control advertisements may be exercised only in the interests of amenity and public safety, taking account of any material factors. We suggest adding to the policy “Adverts which obscure windows, including shop front windows will not be permitted”	No change proposed to the plan.	LP297-23
7	Our preference, as we have argued since 2012, is for Manchester, like some other world cities to have a ban on advertising in public spaces. This would discourage excessive consumption – a driver of climate change and ecological damage and of household debt, and it would also improve the visual environment. To the extent that the above will not be implemented, then we agree broadly with the guidance. However, we would like to see the banning	No change proposed to the plan. The changes proposed would not conform with national policy and guidance.	LP292-33, LP261-43

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	of illuminated advertisements. These distract drivers and are an eyesore, particularly when they are flashing. It seems they are routinely erected without planning permission.		
8	We note that a Guardian analysis in 2022 concluded that Manchester's on-street digital billboards consume as much electricity in a year as 3 homes, and AdFree Cities calculated that a large digital billboard could consume as much as 11 homes. The proliferation of digital billboards thus conflicts with Manchester's target to be zero carbon by 2038. In the list of matters the Council will take account of "In determining applications for free standing advertisement displays...", we therefore propose adding "the carbon emissions associated with the operation of the proposed display"	No change proposed to the plan. The changes proposed would not conform with national policy and guidance.	LP290-28
9	We strongly support the principle that proposals for advertisements will be required to take account of the general characteristics of the locality. We note that the City Outdoor Media Ltd advertisement on the Euro car parks site is incongruous with its surroundings and does not meet the policy tests as currently set out. Any future applications relating to this or any other advertisements in and around the NOMA site should be clearly tested against Policy DM6 and current relevant policy.	General support noted	LP280-9
10	Policy DM 6 (Advertisements) sets out at clause (i) that the Council will take into account "the number of advertisements in the locality and their	General support noted. No change proposed to the plan. The policy wording provides sufficient flexibility that takes account of the issue raised. The policy	LP23-10, LP276-18

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	cumulative effect on visual amenity“ in determining applications for advertisements. We consider that this approach is unduly restrictive, as it may result in well-designed advertisement schemes being refused solely because neighbouring units have a cluttered or poorly designed appearance. Applications for advertisement consent should instead be assessed on their individual merits, rather on the cumulative effect of signage in the surrounding area. Accordingly, it is considered important that this clause is removed. It is also noted that Policy DM 5 does not refer to digital or illuminated signage, despite their growing prevalence in contemporary retail environments. As outlined above, contemporary retail destinations and operators increasingly utilise such signage to maintain brand identity and enhance the customer experience. This is vital for creating a vibrant and engaging retail environment within city centres, helping to attract footfall and support the day and night-time economy. When appropriately designed, this type of signage contributes to a sense of activity and safety, reinforcing an area’s appeal as a lively and successful shopping destination. Indeed, the Manchester 2023 Retail and Leisure Study (April 2024) highlights the need for the comparison goods offer <i>“to become more ‘experiential’ to encourage shoppers onto the high street, and to ensure that shopping is viewed as a pleasurable pastime. The</i>	provides sufficient guidance to consider issues on a case-by-case basis in any development proposals.	

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	<i>shopping experience needs to evolve and diversify both to attract footfall and convert increased activity into sales.”</i> Digital and illuminated signage has the potential to play a key role in facilitating this. As such, we consider it important that the policy should incorporate an additional point which sets out when digital and illuminated signage may be considered, as follows: <i>In determining applications for free standing advertisement displays, free-standing pavement displays and advertisements attached to buildings, including fascias, hanging signage and banners, the Council will take account of the following matters: (page 207) In the case of digital or illuminated signage, whether the proposal is of a high design quality which will not result in any adverse visual impact and is well integrated with the design, style and detailing of a shopfront as well as the character of the surrounding area.</i>		
11	It would be helpful to have acknowledgment in the policy of the particular problems caused to district centres of illuminated signs.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy wording provides sufficient flexibility that takes account of the issue/objection raised. No change proposed to the policy. The changes proposed would not conform with national policy and guidance.	LP267-52
12	A criterion should be added such that the Council also has to take account of the carbon emissions associated with the operation of digital billboards.	No change proposed to the plan. The changes proposed would not conform with national policy and guidance.	LP27-19

Question No 74 - Aviation Noise

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (4) In Part (0) No (0)

Yes (LP321-72, LP305-29, LP292-34, LP28-74)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Support.	Support noted.	LP305-29
2	National Highways states coordination between aviation noise and SRN infrastructure is recommended for developments close to SRN corridors.	Comments noted.	LP321-72
3	Add an additional requirement for year on year noise reduction.	No change proposed to the plan. Aviation noise is affected by many factors which relate to issues outside the control of planning policy.	LP261-44, LP292-34
4	Questions how the proposed increase in air traffic at Manchester Airport will fit with the objective to reduce aviation noise.	No change proposed to the plan. Aviation noise is affected by many factors which relate to issues outside the control of planning policy.	LP28-74
	Policies Map		
5	With regard to the noise contour areas, the explanatory text at paragraph 16.10 directs developers to Manchester Airport's website for the latest version of the noise contours. This is appropriate given that the noise contour maps are updated annually.	Comments noted.	LP305-30

Question No 75 - Manchester Airport Public Safety Zone

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (2) In Part (1) No (0)

Yes (LP321-73, LP28-75)

In part (LP305-30)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	National Highways indicate this policy is only relevant to them if development within the Public Safety Zone affects the SRN.	Comments noted.	LP321-73
2	Manchester Airport recommends amendments to Policy DM 8 to use the full name of the designation "Policy DM 8 Manchester Airport Public Safety Zones ".	Change agreed. Amend policy title to: "Policy DM 8 Manchester Airport Public Safety Zones "	LP305-30
3	Should the policy address threats to public safety by drones?	No change proposed to the plan. See response to question 76 point 1.	LP28-75
	Policies Map		
4	Manchester Airport welcomes the inclusion of the Manchester Airport Strategic Site and the Public Safety Controlled and Restricted Zones on the Policies Map.	Comments noted.	LP305-30

Question No 76 - Aerodrome Safeguarding

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (1) In Part (1) No (0)

Yes (LP280-76)

In part (LP305-31)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
1	Manchester Airport's recommended amendments to Policy DM 9 related to construction, stating: "Consideration is also given to whether the construction phase of development will present any hazards through the creation of dust and smoke, use of materials that could become airborne in proximity to the aerodrome, need for gas purging, use of drones, use of temporary equipment including lighting and cranes. Further information regarding these matter can be found here: https://www.manchesterairport.co.uk/community/living-near-the-airport/aerodrome-safeguarding/	Change agreed. Amend policy and add: "Consideration will be given to the construction phase of development and any hazards through the creation of dust and smoke, use of materials that could become airborne in proximity to the aerodrome, need for gas purging, use of drones, use of temporary equipment including lighting and cranes."	LP305-31
2	Should the policy address threats to public safety by drones?	Change agreed. See point 1 above.	LP28-76
	Policies Map		
3	Manchester Airport welcomes the inclusion of Public Safety Controlled and Restricted Zones on the Policies Map.	Comments noted.	LP305-31

Question No 77 - Planning Obligations (Developer Contributions)

Do you agree with this policy? Yes (5) In Part (155) No (0)

Yes (LP385-58, LP309-63, LP284-32, LP28-77, LP9-45)

In part (LP2-5, LP25-18, LP31-2 – LP180-2, LP261-12, LP267-53, LP272-23, LP292-35)

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	General Comments		
1	Support the policy.	Support noted.	LP-309-63
2	Policy is supported in general. Specific wording proposed to reflect PfE policy (JP D2) covering the prioritisation of planning obligations on a site by site basis; and the need for flexibility and constructive dialogue in the delivery of any identified S106 requirements.	Support noted. No changes proposed to the plan. The specific requests are in effect already covered by the policy and supporting text.	LP-272-23
3	Support for the policy. Suggest that planning obligations were to be in place before the development is allowed.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan. The suggestion to put S106 in place before development is allowed would not meet national policy/guidance.	LP-286-77
4	Suggest policy references Regulation 122(2) tests within the policy. Links to the IDP are required to provide clarity on infrastructure that needs to be delivered.	No change proposed to the plan. Including the Section 122(2) tests is not necessary as they are already set out in national policy and guidance. The Local Plan will be accompanied by an IDP which will set out appropriate indicators.	LP-269-20
5	Suggest the plan is accompanied by a monitoring framework.	No change proposed to the plan. The monitoring framework for the Local Plan will be produced as	LP-269-20

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
		part of the Regulation 19 consultation documents.	
6	Policy is supported. Reference is made to the national proposals for an Infrastructure Levy and requests further discussions about how any national regime may be implemented in Manchester, in due course.	Support noted. Any proposals for a national infrastructure levy will be considered as and when they are introduced.	LP-284-32
7	Consider the policy needs to be phrased to tighten up indicate the presumption that developers will meet their obligations.	No change proposed to the plan. It is considered the policy wording provides sufficient specific wording whilst providing the necessary flexibility required by national policy.	LP-267-53
8	Policy supported. Suggest S106 should be agreed prior to development is permitted.	Support noted.	LP-28-77
	Viability		
9	Concerned that developers will use viability assessments to avoid providing 30% affordable housing.	No change proposed to the plan. The current process for consideration of viability is governed by national policy and guidance.	LP-180-2, LP-179-2, LP-178-2, LP-177-2, LP-176-2, LP-175-2, LP-174-2, LP-173-2, LP-172-2, LP 171-2, LP-170-2, LP-169-2, LP-168-2, LP-167-2, LP-166-2, LP-165-2, LP-164-2, LP-163-2, LP-162-2, LP-161-2, LP-160-2, LP-159-2, LP-158-2, LP-157-2,

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
			LP-156-2, LP-155-2, LP-154-2, LP-153-2, LP-152-2, LP-151-2, LP-150-2, LP-149-2, LP-148-2, LP-147-2, LP-146-2, LP-145-2, LP-144-2, LP-143-2, LP-142-2, LP-141-2, LP-140-2, LP-139-2, LP-138-2, LP-137-2, LP-136-2, LP-135-2, LP-134-2, LP-133-2, LP-132-2, LP-131-2, LP-130-2, LP-129-2 LP-128-2, LP-127-2 LP-126-2, LP-125-2, LP-124-2, LP-123-2, LP-122-2, LP-121-2, LP-120-2, LP-119-2 LP-118-2, LP-117-2 LP-116-2, LP-115-2
9 (cont)	Concerned that developers will use viability assessments to avoid providing 30% affordable housing.		LP-114-2, LP-113-2 LP-112-2, LP-111-2 LP-110-2, LP-109-2 LP-108-2, LP-107-2 LP-106-2, LP-105-2 LP-104-2, LP-103-2 LP-102-2, LP-101-2 LP-100-2, LP-99-2

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
			LP-98-2, LP-97-2 LP-96-2, LP-95-2 LP-94-2, LP-93-2 LP-92-2, LP-91-2 LP-90-2, LP-89-2 LP-88-2, LP-87-2 LP-86-2, LP-85-2 LP-84-2, LP-83-2 LP-82-2, LP-81-2 LP-80-2, LP-79-2 LP-78-2, LP-77-2 LP-76-2, LP-75-2, LP-74-2, LP-73-2 LP-72-2, LP-71-2 LP-70-2, LP-69-2 LP-68-2, LP-67-2 LP-66-2, LP-65-2 LP-64-2, LP-63-2 LP-62-2, LP-61-2 LP-60-2, LP-59-2 LP-58-2, LP-57-2 LP-56-2, LP-55-2 LP-54-2, LP-53-2 LP-52-2, LP-51-2 LP-50-2, LP-49-2 LP-48-2, LP-47-2 LP-46-2, LP-45-2

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
9 (cont)	Concerned that developers will use viability assessments to avoid providing 30% affordable housing.		LP-44-2, LP-43-2 LP-42-2, LP-41-2 LP-40-2, LP-39-2 LP-38-2, LP-37-2 LP-36-2, LP-35-2 LP-34-2, LP-33-2 LP-32-2, LP-31-2
10	Requests that developers must meet obligations in all cases with public scrutiny of viability assessments, including ensuring no conflicts of interest occur in the process of checking viability assessments.	No change proposed to the plan. The process requires the specific tests for requesting S106 are considered to ensure any S106 agreement can be legally enforced. The testing of viability assessments includes the provision of access to documentation by the public. The process of testing abides by agreed principles published by professional bodies.	LP-292-35
11	Any developer contributions need to be tested via the viability appraisal for the Local Plan. The reconciliation clause in the policy should allow for changes in viability that mean a reduced S106 contribution should be considered.	No change proposed to the plan. There is no need to change the clause for reconciliation as this is specifically tied to the matter of affordable housing not being offered in the initial case and therefore there would not be a case where a worsened set of circumstances could be applied.	LP-269-20
	Transport		
12	Identify the need for cumulative impact to be assessed with respect to s278 agreements.	No change proposed to the plan.	LP-358-13, LP-374-24

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
		The national policy and guidance on developer contributions requires the impacts to be considered on a case-by-case basis preventing the cumulative impacts being considered in the manner requested by the response.	LP-311-14 LP-281-12
13	Identifies the need for developer contributions for the Trans Pennine Trail and National Cycle Network.	No change proposed to the plan. The policy includes provision sustainable transport which would include potential delivery of aspects of the Trans Pennine Network and National Cycle Network.	LP-365-20
14	General support for the policy. Specific request to include rail infrastructure.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan. The policy includes a reference to sustainable transport that is considered sufficient in that it includes rail infrastructure within that term - this is expanded in policies T 1and T 3.	LP-268-10
15	Policy supported. Request the specific mention to “canal towpath and access improvements” within the matters listed within the policy.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan. The request for specific wording is not required as it is considered the current bullet point including sustainable transport is sufficient.	LP-315-29
	Social Infrastructure		
16	Suggest the policy needs to be more explicit on what contributions should be provided by developers. The policy needs to provide clarity on how developers will be expected to meet	No change proposed to the plan. The policy is worded to ensure flexibility is applied in terms of the delivery of S106 contributions as required by national policy and	LP-388-9 LP-383-6 LP-379-25 LP-308-39

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	infrastructure needs; and to include details on how the policy will allow for the specific needs of existing communities to be addressed in the prioritisation list.	guidance. The application of the policy on a case-by-case basis would enable specific requirements to be identified at that time. No changes are proposed or the policy.	LP-296-21
17	Policy supported. Specific request for a policy to include requirements for public accessible toilets in district and local centres, city centre and for accessible toilets in pubs, restaurants, event sites and transport sites and in new public realm developments.	No change proposed to the plan. The request for a policy covering public accessible toilets is covered by other legislation and therefore there is no specific need to include this in the Local Plan.	LP-385-58
18	Identify and support the need for health care infrastructure funding via developer contributions. A process for achieving this need is set out in the response. Specific comment on healthcare providers should have flexibility in determining the most appropriate means of meeting the relevant healthcare needs arising from a new development, including through determining the preferred form of mitigation.	No change proposed to the plan. It is considered the policy provides sufficient clarity and flexibility that will ensure healthcare is considered in an appropriate manner. The request for further flexibility can be met by the application and delivery of the policies within the Local Plan when determining specific case by case proposals.	LP-319-5
19	General comments setting out that the Plan should be cognisant of issues around the demand and supply of electricity as a result of new development and changing patterns of energy consumption.	No change proposed to the plan. The plan includes policies that deal with net zero and electricity demand (ZC1 to ZC4).	LP-366-1
20	General support for the policy. Specific point raised on the need for new and/or improved indoor and outdoor sports facilities as a result of any	Support noted. Policy SI 2 provides further detail on the provision of new facilities and cross refers to Policy DC 1 on Developer Contributions.	LP-9-45

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
	increase in demand from new residential development.		
	Culture and Heritage		
21	Request the policy includes a requirement for any new developer in a heritage or conservation area to produce an environmental and heritage protection plan.	No change proposed to the plan. The proposed additional policy wording for environmental and heritage protection plans is in effect already covered by Policies D4 and D5.	LP-374-24
22	Support for the inclusion of cultural heritage within the policy.	Support noted.	LP-318-35
23	Policy supported with a suggestion that cultural facilities are included alongside community facilities.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan. The policy already identifies the protection and enhancement of cultural facilities, so it is not considered necessary to add a further reference to cultural facilities. No change proposed for the policy.	LP-313-3
	Natural Environment		
24	Policy supported. Specific request for biodiversity to be included in the list within the policy. Request that enforcement of agreements is adequately funded to ensure responses to planning breaches.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan. The bullet points within the policy are considered to cover biodiversity without the need to specifically include it (e.g. Protection or enhancement of environmental value; and Provision of Green Infrastructure). The response to planning breaches will always require consideration as to whether it is expedient to	LP-291-45

	Respondents comments	MCC Response	Respondent ID
		take action via enforcement, notwithstanding any specific resource considerations.	
25	Specific reference for the need to improve NV.	No change proposed to the plan.	LP-261-12
26	Policy supported in part. Suggest that Cyan Lines and other green infrastructure routes to be added to list of investments in Policy DC 1.	Support noted. No change proposed to the plan. Policy DC 1 contains a number of references that are considered sufficient to cover the suggested additional inclusion (e.g. Protection or enhancement of environmental value, Green Infrastructure including open space, and public realm improvements).	LP-25-18
27	Requesting policy approach for offsetting loss of biodiversity to be located near the development that takes place. Proposed policy should be applied retrospectively.	No change proposed to the plan. Policies EN4 and EN5 provide for the retention and mitigation for biodiversity as proposed by the respondent.	LP-2-5